

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by **David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/16/3159359

219 Station Road, Harrow HA1 2TH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jitendra Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1691/16, dated 1 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a Single Storey Ground Floor Extension to Shop and Loft Conversion to Create Additional Dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Jitendra Patel against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace two-storey building situated at the junction of Station Road and Greenhill Way with a hardware shop at ground floor level and residential use above. The neighbouring properties comprise of a dense mix of generally two and three-storey terraced properties with ground floor commercial uses and residential uses at the upper levels.
 5. The proposal would involve the construction of a mansard roof extension over the main roof and a two storey outrigger projection at the rear of the property to create an additional flat in the roof space. The proposal would be of a flat topped design built off the ridge of the main roof sloping towards the rear with a vertical elevation built off the rear building line of the property. It would also involve a single storey rear extension, rooflights on the front roof slope and a new front door to provide access to the residential accommodation.
 6. The design and appearance of the proposed roof extension would be very much at odds with the older more traditional character and appearance of the host
-

property and other similar properties in the area and the advice contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010 (SPD). This requires a more traditional roof form for such development where roof alterations complement the original street character and do not dominate buildings nor impair their proportions or character.

7. The roof extension would result in a material alteration to the property's roof which, when viewed from the rear of the building, currently makes a positive contribution to the roofscape of the terrace of properties and the character and appearance of the area. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the increased height of the large southern flank wall of the building and the roof extension's prominent position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Greenhill Way, Station Road and from Fairholme Road at the rear. As such I consider that the proposed extension, by virtue of its siting, scale and design, would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition to the host property and the street scene.
8. I have considered the appellant's comments that the design of the proposed development is intended to accord with the relevant planning policies and the pre-application advice of the Council. The Council, however, are not bound by the officer's pre-application advice in making their final decision. I note the appellant's comments regarding the planning permission for the four storey hotel, currently under construction on the adjacent site to the south of the property. Whilst this would assist in screening the visual prominence of the proposal to the south of the site once completed, this would not overcome the adverse effects from the rear as outlined above. I therefore accord these matters limited weight.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed roof extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The development conflicts with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016, Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, AAP2 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Action Area Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrates a high quality design that respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and distinctiveness of the area. The development does not accord with the Council's SPD which includes similar aims relating to good design for roof extensions as set out above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR